FILED

JAN 0 6 2009

U.S. DISTRICT COURT MARTINSBURG, WV 25401

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA MARTINSBURG

**GREGORY K. CLINTON,** 

Plaintiff,

٧.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:08-CV-10 (BAILEY)

BERKELEY COUNTY, SGT. OLACK, CPL. B. BEAN, TROOPER ELWANGER AND TROOPER CASTLE,

Defendants.

## ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On this day, the above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Opinion/Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge John S. Kaull. By Standing Order this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Kaull for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R & R"). Magistrate Judge Kaull filed his R & R on December 12, 2008 [Doc. 44]. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court grant the defendants' Motions to Dismiss/Motion for Summary Judgment [Docs. 26 & 40] and dismiss the plaintiff's Complaint [Doc. 1].

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1) (c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140,

150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo

review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Snyder v.

Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91,

94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Kaull's R & R were due within ten

(10) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b). The docket

reflects that service was accepted on December 17, 2008. No objections have been filed.

Accordingly, this Court will review the report and recommendation for clear error.

Upon careful review of the report and recommendation, it is the opinion of this Court

that the magistrate judge's Opinion/Report and Recommendation [Doc. 44] should be,

and is, hereby ORDERED ADOPTED for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate

judge's report. Accordingly, the Court is of the opinion that the Motion to Dismiss

Dismiss/Motion for Summary Judgment [Docs. 26 & 40] should be, and the same hereby

are, GRANTED. As such, this Court hereby DENIES and DISMISSES without prejudice

the plaintiff's Complaint [Doc. 1]. Therefore, the matter is hereby ORDERED STRICKEN

from the active docket of this Court.

It is so ORDERED.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and

to mail a copy to the pro se petitioner.

DATED: January 6, 2009.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE